

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 are amended for clarity. Support for the newly added features in claim 1 can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0064] and [0065] of the originally filed specification. Claim 10 has been rewritten into independent form. No new matter has been added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Knable at the telephone interview held January 21, 2010, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed during the telephone interview, claim 1 has been amended responsive to the rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As discussed during the telephone interview, support for claim 10 can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0028], [0029] and [0065] of the originally filed specification. Thus, the specification contains sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. The amount of experimentation needed to practice the invention is neither undue nor unreasonable because none of the steps of the method as claimed are beyond the level of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. As discussed during the telephone interview, claims 1, 6 and 10 have been

amended responsive to the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamakawa et al., EP 0 448 407, in view of Okada et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0002608. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites measuring, for one cycle, a wave form, which is a change in a circumferential direction of a radial distance from a central axis of rotation of the molding drum of an inflated carcass band, of the radial-run out of the carcass band inflated and deformed in the toroidal shape to adjust a position of a carcass band in the bead core such that a phase  $f$  of a primary harmonic component and an amplitude  $Y$  of the wave form are canceled out. Neither Yamakawa nor Okada disclose, or would have rendered obvious, the above-referenced features of claim 1 because neither reference discusses measuring radial run-out or using such a measurement to adjust a position of the carcass band and the bead cores.

Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11 and 12 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamakawa in view of Okada and at least one of Akiyama, U.S. Patent No. 6,475,319, and Ikeda, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0074077. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection of claim 2 is premised upon Yamakawa and Okada disclosing, or having rendered obvious, all of the features of claim 1. As discussed above, Yamakawa and Okada fail to do so. Further, Akiyama and Ikeda fail to overcome the deficiencies of Yamakawa and Okada. Thus, claim 2 is patentable by reason of its dependency from claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2002-254529 (JP '529) in view of Yamakawa. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites measuring, for one cycle, a wave form, which is a change in a circumferential direction of a radial distance from a central axis of rotation of the molding drum of an inflated carcass band, of the radial run-out of the carcass band inflated and deformed in a toroidal shape to adjust a position of the carcass band and bead core such that a phase  $f$  of a primary harmonic component and an amplitude  $Y$  of the wave form are canceled out. JP '529 and Yamakawa fail to disclose these features because neither reference discloses, or would have rendered obvious, measuring a radial run-out of a carcass band or using that measurement to adjust a position of the carcass band and the bead core.

Claims 2, 9, 11 and 12 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP '529 in view of Yamakawa and Okada. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection of claims 2-5, 7 and 8 is premised upon JP '529 and Yamakawa disclosing, or having rendered obvious, all the features of claim 1. As discussed above, these references fail to do so. Further, Okada fails to overcome the deficiencies of JP '529 and Yamakawa. Thus, claims 2-5, 7 and 8 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamakawa in view of Okada and Senbokuya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,616,783, or in view of JP '529 in view of Yamakawa and Senbokuya. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection of claim 6 is premised upon either Yamakawa and Okada or JP '529, Yamakawa and Okada having disclosed or rendered obvious all of the features of claim 1. As discussed above, these references fail to do so. Further, Senbokuya fails to overcome the deficiencies of these references. Thus, claim 6 is patentable by reason of its dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.


Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamakawa in view of Okada and WO 03/05675 (WO '675) or JP '529, Yamakawa and WO '675. An English translation of JP 2002-341279 is concurrently filed herewith. Upon information and belief, the translation is an accurate English translation. Thus, WO 03/045675 cannot be asserted against this application. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 10 is provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/497,069 in view of the prior art as applied against claim 1 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants request that the rejection be held in abeyance until the claims are otherwise found allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks

Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/crh

Attachments:

Translation of JP 2002-341279

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: February 1, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**

**P.O. Box 320850**

**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**

**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry of this filing;

Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461